

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Alexis Centeno, #14146-055,

Plaintiff,

VS.

Mr. J. Meeks, Warden; Mrs. Simmons, Assistance Warden; Mr. Ray Burn, Capetian; Mrs. Urrea, HSA; Mr. Whitehurst, AHSA; Dr. Luranth, Medical Director; Dr. Massa, Medical Doctor,

Defendants.

C/A No.: 4:16-1482-BHH

## ORDER AND OPINION

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. On November 16, 2016, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that this case be dismissed with prejudice for failure to file a response to the pending motion dismiss. (ECF No. 30.)

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *Id.* The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made.

Plaintiff filed no objections and the time for doing so expired on December 5, 2016. In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. See *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 and advisory committee's note).

Here, because no objections have been filed, the Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations for clear error. Finding none, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff's claims against Defendant should be dismissed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is adopted and incorporated herein by reference and this action is DISMISSED with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

December 9, 2016  
Greenville, South Carolina

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.